

## **Attachment 5**

### **Transcripts of the Planning Commission Meeting July 11, 2012**

## CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

## PLANNING COMMISSION

## M E E T I N G

Held at Mission Memorial Conference Room, Mission  
Memorial Building, 550 South King Street, Honolulu,  
Hawaii 96813, commencing at 1:38 p.m., on  
July 11, 2012, pursuant to Notice.

BEFORE: SUE M. FLINT, RPR, CSR 274

Notary Public, State of Hawaii

## Planning Commission:

JAMES C. PACOPAC, Member

BEADIE K. DAWSON, Member

KAIULANI SODARO, Member

RODNEY KIM, Member

ARTHUR TOLENTINO, Member

## For the Planning Commission:

WINSTON K.Q. WONG, ESQ.

Deputy Corporation Counsel

Department of the Corporation Counsel

530 South King Street, Room 110

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

## M E E T I N G

MEMBER PACOPAC: First of all, let me get through the minutes. Did we send out the minutes? Everyone saw the minutes?

MS. SUMIDA: Yes.

MEMBER DAWSON: The transcript.

MEMBER PACOPAC: Yes, the transcript. Can I have a motion to approve?

MEMBER TOLENTINO: Motion to approve.

MEMBER DAWSON: Second.

MEMBER PACOPAC: All in favor?

(Unanimous aye.)

MEMBER PACOPAC: Number one on the agenda, the Ewa - State Special Use Permit was cancelled, so notice went out that it's not on our agenda today. If you're here for that, it's been cancelled.

So we're going to the second, unfinished business from June 27th, which was a bill to amend the Ewa Development Plan. Just to recapture what happened -- again, the transcripts were sent out. Everybody read their transcript, I assume.

MEMBER KIM: Yes.

MEMBER PACOPAC: We deferred for decision making. We had closed the public hearing, so there is no testimony today. It will be a motion and then

1 a discussion and then a decision will be made. So  
2 to begin the subject, do I have a motion?

3 MEMBER DAWSON: I move to discuss the  
4 subject of the Ewa Development Plan.

5 MEMBER TOLENTINO: Second.

6 MEMBER PACOPAC: To discuss -- we are  
7 going to discuss. We don't need a motion discuss.

8 MEMBER SODARO: A motion to approve the  
9 item.

10 MEMBER PACOPAC: Do we have a second?

11 MEMBER TOLENTINO: Second.

12 MEMBER PACOPAC: Now we can go into  
13 discussion.

14 MEMBER SODARO: I just wanted to address  
15 the various concerns that were raised by some of the  
16 testifiers around the symbols and just note that my  
17 understanding is that the DPP is on record that the  
18 symbols are generic to an area and not specific to a  
19 spot. So in this discussion, why I moved to amend  
20 or -- excuse me -- to approve the motion as stated  
21 is that I don't think it requires an amendment to  
22 address that point.

23 MEMBER DAWSON: Agreed.

24 MEMBER PACOPAC: Agreed. I think Bob made  
25 it clear at the last hearing that it was just

1 symbolic, so we have that in the record.

2 Any other discussion for the Ewa plan?

3 MEMBER TOLENTINO: I have --

4 MEMBER DAWSON: Yeah.

5 MEMBER PACOPAC: Do you have a question?

6 MEMBER DAWSON: I had a question.

7 MEMBER PACOPAC: Go ahead.

8 MEMBER DAWSON: I'd like to know if  
9 there's any further information on how we go about  
10 funding the schools. The plan is dependent upon  
11 having schools that apparently we don't have funds  
12 for. So is there some recommendation or perhaps  
13 some mechanism for urging funding? It seems  
14 unrealistic to have all these schools with no  
15 funding.

16 MEMBER PACOPAC: Well, the funding, I  
17 think, comes from the State. It's not under the  
18 county. Therefore --

19 MEMBER DAWSON: Clearly, there ought to be  
20 something that the State can do to encourage that --  
21 I mean, the Council can do to encourage that.

22 Can we, Winston?

23 MEMBER PACOPAC: I think the State  
24 overrules the county.

25 MEMBER DAWSON: They do. But I hate to

1 leave it to chance. Schools are pretty important.

2 MEMBER SODARO: I think the department  
3 made it clear, Beadie, their support of DOE's recent  
4 impact fee. So what I got from the presentation and  
5 from the plan is that the plan then supports any  
6 State efforts to get any new development to  
7 contribute their fair share for education, so that  
8 was a change in the plan; them being proactive in  
9 supporting that.

10 MEMBER DAWSON: Actually, that Council  
11 will be proactive in urging funding.

12 MEMBER PACOPAC: I think at that point the  
13 Council can take that subject up. Again, the  
14 funding comes from the State and they do have an  
15 impact fee which I think they are working towards.  
16 All the developers who come in will pay their fair  
17 share for the schools, and that will help the  
18 Department of Education with the funding of the  
19 schools, depending on when it comes out.

20 MEMBER DAWSON: True.

21 MEMBER PACOPAC: We don't know when the  
22 developments are going to come up.

23 MEMBER DAWSON: I have another question  
24 for Mister --

25 MEMBER PACOPAC: Stanfield?

1 MEMBER DAWSON: -- Mr. Stanfield. Maybe  
2 you can clarify what measures the plan is going to  
3 take for implementing bus transportation. I didn't  
4 quite get that from either your testimony or from  
5 the plan itself.

6 MR. STANFIELD: The plan does support an  
7 integrated transportation system, and including the  
8 routing of buses and connection of buses so that  
9 there's sort of a seamless connection between the  
10 bus collection and distribution system and the main  
11 trunk, which would be the elevated rail rapid  
12 transit system.

13 And in terms of the background, the plan  
14 does include information about what the plans are,  
15 existing plans are for the upgrading of the bus  
16 system. Basically, for the details on that, the  
17 details are in a bus plan that has recently been  
18 drafted by DTS and the plans for the HART system,  
19 which also talk about the inter-connections, the  
20 design of transit stations so that bus access works,  
21 a number of those details. The details then are  
22 worked out in those more detailed plans.

23 MEMBER DAWSON: According to your  
24 testimony here, it's a vision that the rail system,  
25 bus system and whatever improvements can be made to

1 the highway are supposed to work as kind of a  
2 coordinated system?

3 (Mr. Stanfield nods.)

4 MEMBER DAWSON: I think that should  
5 alleviate a lot of disturbed feelings from people in  
6 the community, if they know that all of that is  
7 going to work together, and hopefully, it will bring  
8 some relief to the commuters.

9 MR. STANFIELD: I just would want to  
10 clarify that what is in front of you are a list of  
11 changes to the plan, and to the extent we strengthen  
12 the policies and get Council on record as supporting  
13 those policies, that's a very good thing.

14 The devil is in the details; it's in the  
15 implementation. So putting things in the plan is  
16 the first step. The next step is making sure that  
17 the plan is being implemented.

18 In addition to changes to the plan,  
19 there's a number of suggestions on a variety of  
20 topics as to how we can do better on implementation.  
21 Those would be things we would hope Council and the  
22 State legislature might take up.

23 MEMBER DAWSON: It's very difficult to  
24 have to count on another agency, if you will, the  
25 State, to do certain things and the Council to do



1 certain things. They are independent entities.  
2 They're not required to work together. But we'd  
3 like to hope that they will.

4 MR. STANFIELD: If I can -- I think there  
5 are some examples of that sort of State/City  
6 cooperation. The Oahu Metropolitan Planning  
7 Organization, for example, coordinates all of the  
8 State and City transportation planning in one  
9 agency, so there are some examples of the State and  
10 the counties working together in joint ways,  
11 coordinated ways.

12 MEMBER DAWSON: Do you have any  
13 information on -- there seemed to be some question  
14 in the testimony about what public meetings have  
15 been held and what neighborhood boards have been  
16 given the plan. Could you elaborate a little bit on  
17 that for us?

18 MR. STANFIELD: Certainly. Thank you for  
19 that question. As you noticed, several testifiers  
20 claimed that our department had not consulted with  
21 the community on proposed reforms, that members of  
22 the community had not had an opportunity to review  
23 the proposed changes or provide comments on those  
24 changes or work with the department to reach  
25 agreement on what improvements to the plan or its

1 implementation are needed.

2 For the record, Dr. Kioni Dudley, Glenn  
3 Oamilda, Celeste LaCuesta, who were testifiers, they  
4 all received copies of the 2008 public review draft  
5 proposed plan. They all provided comments on the  
6 draft plan, which are documented, along with our  
7 responses, in Appendix C of the review report and as  
8 is documented in the review report and in handouts  
9 that we have provided recently.

10 Since the fall of 2008, when we published  
11 the public review draft, we distributed to members  
12 of the public, including a copy to each member of  
13 the two neighborhood boards, and it was posted on  
14 the web. We made a presentation to the Makakilo  
15 board and an announcement about the plan's  
16 availability in a workshop were made to the Ewa  
17 board when they were holding a candidate forum. We  
18 held a workshop in October 2008 which filled the  
19 room of the east Kapolei conference room for the  
20 DHHL headquarters.

21 We extended the comment period on the  
22 draft plan for six months at the request of the Ewa  
23 Neighborhood Board. At the end of the six-month  
24 period, we received no formal comments from either  
25 the Ewa board or the Makakilo board on changes they

1 wanted made to the draft plan, or clarifications,  
2 suggestions for improvements. We received over 60  
3 written and email comments which we analyzed and, as  
4 appropriate, incorporated in proposed changes into  
5 the plan or its implementation. Those comments are  
6 documented in Appendix C of Volume I of the review  
7 report.

8 We published the review report and the  
9 proposed plan in the fall of 2011 and we distributed  
10 copies, once again, to members of the public,  
11 including every member of the two neighborhood  
12 boards, and posted them on the web. We made  
13 presentation to both boards, at which members of the  
14 public were invited to contact the department and  
15 ask questions, talk about their concerns, see if  
16 there was some way that we could reach a consensus  
17 on ways that we could ask for changes when we went  
18 to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

19 And finally, we held a public information  
20 on the review and the proposed changes to the plan  
21 November 1st at Kapolei Hale, to help members of the  
22 public prepare for their opportunity to participate  
23 in this review by the Commission and the City  
24 Council.

25 So I don't think a fair reading would say

1 we have not provided copies of the proposed changes  
2 to the public or that we have failed to consult with  
3 them or incorporate their comments. In fact, a  
4 number of changes were made since the public review  
5 draft came out, to incorporate concerns,  
6 particularly with regard to emergency shelter  
7 provision. It's added because of a comment received  
8 from the public. Comments about light pollution are  
9 added. Comments about surveys that are needed to  
10 protect Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological  
11 sites were added. In chapter three, it identifies  
12 those changes that have been made since the public  
13 review draft came out.

14 MEMBER DAWSON: Did those comments come  
15 from individuals or from a board vote?

16 MR. STANFIELD: We received no formal  
17 comments on either the public review draft or the  
18 final proposed plan from either one of the boards.  
19 We did receive comments from -- individual comments  
20 from members of those boards, which are documented  
21 in Appendix C in the first volume of the review  
22 report.

23 MEMBER DAWSON: Do we know why the boards  
24 did not comment -- vote negatively or positively on  
25 the plan?

1 MR. STANFIELD: I was told that the only  
2 vote they took was on a motion to call for the  
3 Council to not revise the plan.

4 MEMBER DAWSON: Thank you.

5 MEMBER PACOPAC: Any other questions?

6 MEMBER KIM: Chair, I'm going to vote in  
7 favor of the amendment and I'm satisfied that the  
8 department has given the public ample opportunity to  
9 review the revisions and make revisions to the plan.

10 It's a plan that started back in 1997  
11 that's, you know, gone through many revisions going  
12 forward. Those who have objections will still have  
13 another opportunity when it goes to the City  
14 Council, at least three hearings there, to make  
15 their position known. So there's, you know, a lot  
16 of opportunities to continue the whole process.

17 But I just want to address one point that  
18 was made at the public hearing; that someone  
19 advocated to wait for the Oahu plan to be finalized.  
20 I don't think this plan needs to wait for that. I  
21 think we have to move forward on that. Like I said,  
22 it's been since 1997 -- this is 2012, so -- that's  
23 my reason that I'm going to vote in favor. Thank  
24 you.

25 MEMBER DAWSON: I agree.

1 MEMBER PACOPAC: Any comment?

2 MEMBER SODARO: No additional.

3 MEMBER DAWSON: I might mention that there  
4 was a considerable amount of testimony that came  
5 from the people that were interested in the Haseko  
6 changes from the marina to --

7 MEMBER KIM: Lagoon.

8 MEMBER DAWSON: Yeah -- and the comments  
9 were all pretty much very positive. It convinced me  
10 that it was the right thing to do. Whether or not  
11 they convince anyone who relied on there being a  
12 marina as was promised, that's up to them. But  
13 apparently most people are very much in favor of the  
14 waterfront approach and it does not preclude the  
15 marina. So it's really a non-issue.

16 MEMBER PACOPAC: Any more comments?

17 MEMBER KIM: Chair, I call for a vote.

18 MEMBER PACOPAC: All those in favor to  
19 approve the amended Ewa DP as provided by the  
20 department -- all those in favor say aye.

21 (Unanimous aye.)

22 MEMBER PACOPAC: All those opposed?

23 Hearing none, it's been approved.

24 Our second matter is we were going to have  
25 a new election for chair and vice chair, but --

1 MS. SOKUGAWA: Was that motion to include  
2 just the original or with the addendum with the  
3 department's position?

4 MEMBER PACOPAC: With the department's  
5 position.

6 MS. SOKUGAWA: With the addenda  
7 corrections --

8 MEMBER PACOPAC: Yes. With all the  
9 revised amendments and everything, the revised one.

10 MS. SOKUGAWA: Thank you.

11 MEMBER PACOPAC: Is that good for you?

12 The election of the new chair and vice  
13 chair, I'm going to ask the committee to defer this  
14 to our next meeting, when we have our regular chair  
15 back, because she's the chair, and then we should  
16 have a new member on board, too, so we can do it at  
17 that time. Is that okay with everyone?

18 MEMBER DAWSON: That's the replacement for  
19 Karen?

20 MEMBER PACOPAC: Yes. So nothing further  
21 subject to July 25th? Okay. Motion to adjourn?

22 MEMBER KIM: So moved.

23 MEMBER SODARO: Second.

24 MEMBER PACOPAC: Thank you.

25 (Hearing concluded at 1:55 p.m.)

## C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF HAWAII )

) SS.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU )

I, SUE M. FLINT, Notary Public, State of Hawaii, do hereby certify:

That on July 11, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., the Meeting of the Planning Commission was taken down by me in machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision;

That the foregoing represents to the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

I further certify that I am not an attorney for any of the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned with the cause.

This 15-page transcript dated July 11, 2012, was subscribed and sworn to before me this 22nd day of July 2012, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

*Sue M. Flint*  
SUE M. FLINT, RPR, CSR 274  
Notary Public, State of Hawaii  
My Commission Exp: July 23, 2015

